

REMARKS

In the last Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0097211 to Carroll et al. ("*Carroll*"); rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carroll* in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0210363 to Kataghishi ("*Kataghishi*"); and rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carroll* in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2005/0203684 to Borgesson ("*Borgesson*").

By this amendment, Applicants propose to amend claims 1 and 2 and add new claims 14-17. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1, 2, 12, 13, and 14-17 would be pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Carroll*.

Claim 1, as amended, recites an apparatus including, for example, "means for automatically getting vehicle model information from the vehicle by determining a shape of a connector used to attach the navigation system to the vehicle." *Carroll* does not disclose at least the claimed getting means.

According to the Examiner, *Carroll* discloses "that a user can use a hand-held system (110) from vehicle (10) for getting vehicle model information from said user interface" (Office Action at page 7). However, "us[ing] a hand-held system (110) from vehicle (10) for getting vehicle model information" does not constitute "means for automatically getting vehicle model information from the vehicle by determining a shape of a connector used to attach the navigation system to the vehicle" as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, *Carroll* does not anticipate claim 1. Claim 12 depends from claim 1, and is thus allowable over *Carroll*, for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carroll* in view of *Kataghishi*. *Carroll* and *Kataghishi*, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 2.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and therefore includes all of the elements recited therein. As discussed above, *Carroll* does not disclose at least the getting means of getting vehicle model information of claim 1. *Kataghishi* does not repair the noted deficiency of *Carroll*, because *Kataghishi* fails to disclose the getting means.

Accordingly, *Carroll* and *Kataghishi* fail to render subject matter of claim 2 obvious.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carroll* in view of *Borgesson*. *Carroll* and *Borgesson*, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 13.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12, which depends from claim 1. Therefore claim 13 includes all of the elements recited in claim 12 and claim 1. As discussed above, *Carroll* does not disclose at least the getting means of acquiring vehicle model information of claim 1. *Borgesson* does not repair the noted deficiency of *Carroll*, because *Borgesson* fails to disclose the claimed getting means. Accordingly, *Carroll* and *Borgesson* fail to render subject matter of claim 1 obvious.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment, reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 12, 2007

By: Eli Mazour
Eli Mazour
Reg. No. 59,318